

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

IMPLICIT, LLC, <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div>	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:19-cv-00040-JRG-RSP
IMPERVA, INC.,	§	LEAD CASE
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
IMPLICIT, LLC,	§	
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div>	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:19-cv-00039-JRG-RSP
FORTINET, INC.,	§	CONSOLIDATED CASE
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
IMPLICIT, LLC,	§	
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div>	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:19-cv-00037-JRG-RSP
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,	§	CONSOLIDATED CASE
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
IMPLICIT, LLC,	§	
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff,</i></div>	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:19-cv-00042-JRG-RSP
SOPHOS LTD.,	§	CONSOLIDATED CASE
<div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendant.</i></div>	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		

ORDER

Before the Court is the parties’ Joint Stipulation of Dismissal Pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) at to U.S. Patent Nos. 8,856,779 and 9,325,740 (“Stipulation”). (Dkt. No. 123.) This Stipulation seeks to dismiss Plaintiff Implicit, LLC’s (“Implicit”) claims for patent infringement of the ’779 and ’740 patents without prejudice. (*Id.*)

After consideration, the Court **APPROVES** of the parties’ Stipulation. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff claims for patent infringement of the ’779 and ’740 patents are

DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The clerk is directed to leave this case open as Implicit still has other active claims against the defendants.

SIGNED this 3rd day of September, 2019.



ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE